

IN THE  
**ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS**  
DIVISION TWO

---

IN RE K.E.

No. 2 CA-JV 2016-0186  
Filed December 1, 2016

---

THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND  
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

*See* Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 111(c)(1); Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 28(a)(1), (f);  
Ariz. R. P. Juv. Ct. 103(G).

---

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pima County  
No. JV20150656  
The Honorable Gilbert Rosales Jr., Judge Pro Tempore

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

Domingo DeGrazia, Tucson  
*Counsel for Minor*

IN RE K.E.  
Decision of the Court

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Presiding Judge Vásquez authored the decision of the Court, in which Chief Judge Eckerstrom and Judge Miller concurred.

---

V Á S Q U E Z, Presiding Judge:

¶1 Seventeen-year-old K.E. appeals from the juvenile court's orders adjudicating him delinquent for use of marijuana and ordering him to complete an online marijuana education course. Counsel has filed a brief in reliance on *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating he has reviewed the record and "has found no arguable issues on appeal." See also *In re Maricopa Cty. Juv. Action No. JV-117258*, 163 Ariz. 484, 486-87, 788 P.2d 1235, 1237-38 (App. 1989). He asks this court to review the record for fundamental error.

¶2 We find no reversible error. Viewed in the light most favorable to upholding the juvenile court's orders, see *In re John M.*, 201 Ariz. 424, ¶ 7, 36 P.3d 772, 774 (App. 2001), the evidence established that a security officer had seen K.E. smoking marijuana at school and that the officer had found a glass pipe containing burnt marijuana in the place he saw another student, who smoked with K.E., set the pipe. We also conclude the court appropriately exercised its discretion in its disposition order. See A.R.S. §§ 8-341, 13-3405(A)(1); *In re John G.*, 191 Ariz. 205, ¶ 8, 953 P.2d 1258, 1260 (App. 1998) ("We will not disturb a juvenile court's disposition order absent an abuse of discretion.").

¶3 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have reviewed the record in its entirety and have found no fundamental or reversible error. Accordingly, the juvenile court's adjudication and disposition are affirmed.